



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

what may be my prejudices", as in the preface the reader is begged to do, and forget them.

The style of the book is frank and chatty. It is honest soldier's talk by a soldier. Lord Wolseley believes that the profession of arms is the highest. It does indeed in some characters develop the Christian virtues in the most marked degree, even though war itself be hell. And in every country, though the citizen may not be in the ranks, it is the qualities that go to make up the good soldier that are of the most value to the state.

An occasional good story is told in the volumes, as one of Soyer, the great French chef, who put on his irascible wife's tombstone "*Soyez tranquille*". India developed some *bon mots*, as after the relief of beleaguered Lucknow, one of Clyde's officers telegraphed home "*Nunc fortunatus sum*", *i. e.*, "*I am in luck now.*" Was it Napier in 1843 who sent the despatch "*Peccavi*", *i. e.*, "*I have Sindh*"?

The moral of the book is pointed at the habit of unpreparedness of the Anglo-Saxon nations, which can never understand that safety as well as economy resides only in a condition of constant readiness. Nothing else is so dangerous, so extravagant in the end, as the usual waiting policy of England and America.

The large volumes themselves are well got up, with paper which makes them easy to hold and read. The portrait of the author shows no sign of age, nor of the wound which tore open his face in the Crimean trenches. The story will interest thousands, and after perusing the last paragraph, we shall all welcome its promised continuance, and wish the gallant field-marshal years and strength to complete it.

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

The True History of the Civil War. By GUY CARLETON LEE, Ph.D., of Johns Hopkins University. (Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1903. Pp. 421.)

THE field covered by Mr. Lee's book is extensive, including the origins of sectional division from the landing at Jamestown, the slavery controversy, the Civil War, and the Reconstruction period. Within the narrow limits of four hundred pages the book cannot and does not pretend to be a critical history, to sift evidence or digest facts, or even to balance conflicting opinions. It is necessarily general in style and treatment, and its merits must be those of intelligent selection of matter, reliance upon the best authorities, illuminating comment, and fairness in interpretation. It must be practically an "essay on the causes and conduct of the Civil War", and should be judged as such. Viewed from this standpoint, there are commendable features in *The True Civil War*. The style is vigorous, and the sweeping and general character of the writing is freely relieved by personal anecdotes and brief quotations. The author's point of view is also unconventional and calculated to pique the average reader, for the function of the "true" biography or

history seems to be to emphasize the seamy side of characters or events that are usually dealt with in a eulogistic or complacent manner. In such a spirit Mr. Lee has written a "true history" whose purpose is apparently to subject to steadily searching criticism the motives and actions of the Northern side in the whole slavery contest. There are undoubtedly persons who may profit from reading such a volume, and it is to be hoped that the aggressive style, disregard of technical argument, and attractive appearance of the work may lead them to do so.

But, apart from its style and purpose, the book contains nothing upon the slavery question and the Civil War which has not been more fully and far more impartially set forth in recent years. Not to mention Rhodes's *United States*, there is a study of the same years in Wilson's *American People* which analyzes the motives and conduct of leaders and people with equal freedom from conventional Northern bias and with incomparably greater fairness; and the same is true of the different but equally keen treatment of the Civil War in Morse's *Lincoln*. As compared with any of these, Mr. Lee's book is unreservedly partizan, and a list of the instances where by assertion or implication the Northern states are made to appear at a disadvantage is entirely too long for quotation. To take a few examples, the fact that Northern people once held slaves and that emancipation followed the economic decline of the institution is brought forward as discreditable, and the continuance of Northern ship-owners in the slave-trade is held to prove the hypocrisy of the whole section. Abolitionists are grudgingly admitted to have shown devotion and steadfast purpose, but they are usually referred to under such a title as "frothing fanatics". In one sentence the possibility of inhumanity under slavery is admitted to be good ground for condemning the system, but the writer immediately declares that in fact "the physical well-being of the slave was except in certain limited districts the constant care of his master". John Brown is not mentioned without vituperative condemnation, and no recognition is given to the man's fanatical honesty. This tendency leads the writer to enlarge upon the economic and industrial disadvantages of the South during the war but to make no mention of any social or military conditions favorable to Southern armies. It also leads him to omit the numbers in every action except one where the Confederates were superior, but to insert them as a rule whenever the Union forces were in the majority. It leads him to describe Sherman's march in language of unqualified condemnation but to pass over the massacre at Fort Pillow without comment and to palliate without a condemnatory word the Southern treatment of Northern prisoners. Similarly the arbitrary acts of the Lincoln administration in the North are described without any attempt at justification, but nothing is said on the other hand which condemns the "Copperheads" or recognizes anything questionable in their behavior. Again, the Southern vagrant and apprentice laws after the war are termed "wise and necessary", whereas every step of the Congressional policy is described as "the outcome of the desire for revenge and plunder made possible by the illogical theories of incompetent

Congressmen backed by demagogues and a rabidly sectional press". This sort of thing it is evident is anything but "true" history, yet for all its one-sidedness Mr. Lee's book might be of value as a corrective to Northern complacency were it not for certain features which cannot be overlooked. In the first place, the literary workmanship is by no means flawless. The facts are taken from standard works, and in places the authorities are so closely followed that the result is scarcely more than a paraphrase. Rhodes in particular seems to be relied upon, as for instance on pages 114 to 120, where Rhodes's account of the Kansas troubles (II. 153-159) is condensed, the sequence of thought, the quotations, the anecdotes, and many of the phrases being transferred. Again, Rhodes's account of Fort Donelson and of Shiloh is similarly borrowed. Burgess, also, is apparently laid under contribution, the opening chapter of his *Civil War* furnishing the model for pages 135 to 138 of Mr. Lee's book. Adjectives and style are made more emphatic, but the ideas and facts are reproductions. The more general introductory chapters suffer from another difficulty in the discursive essay style adopted, which leads the author to disregard chronology, to repeat under one chapter what has been elaborated under another, and thus to produce an effect of confusion, which is further increased by the vagueness almost inseparable from writing on such a scale. Seward's "higher law", for instance, is referred to several times but is nowhere explained in any intelligible way. The opinion on the constitutionality of the Missouri Compromise in the Dred Scott case is said to have been *obiter dictum*, but it is not explained why, nor is the actual decision of the court given in any form except in the very loose statement that "a slave did not become free by being taken to a non-slave-holding commonwealth".

Finally it is to be regretted that through carelessness or from some other cause the book contains numerous minor errors ranging from probable misprints to actual misstatements. With the former may be classed the foundation of Georgia in "1773", the abolition of slavery by Rhode Island in "1773", the governorship of Gage in "1744", the fugitive-slave law of "1783", the "moral tariff", and Professor Stillman instead of Silliman. Under the latter heading belong such references as that to the Atherton gag "law", the summary definition of nullification as "the right of a state to veto Federal action", the ascription of a Pennsylvania personal liberty law of 1826 to the Abolition movement, the assertion that after the Prigg case "Northern opposition to slavery cast aside all efforts to clothe itself in legal forms". In the period of the Civil War such loose and inaccurate sentences are frequent. Seward, for example, is said to have given "pledges" that Fort Sumter would be evacuated. The *Manassas* is called "a most formidable craft with almost impenetrable protection"; which the testimony of her officers disproves. The numbers at Vicksburg are given at the outset as 75,000 for Grant against Pemberton's 31,000 and Johnston's 11,000, but Grant's brilliant campaign between the two Confederate armies was made with

not over half his final besieging force. At Chattanooga Sherman is said to have carried Missionary Ridge on November 23, and the dramatic storming is described as taking place then instead of two days later. As might be expected, the author fails to be consistent with himself. On page 210 he says, "the ultimate defeat of the South was a foregone conclusion from the start. The vast preponderance of resources in the North confronted the South as with an inevitable fate". But on page 381 he says the subjugation of the South "was an almost impossible task" and that the North won only because the Southern people "had neither the cause which impels to win nor the spirit to uphold a guerilla warfare". Such looseness of statement is characteristic and leads one to regret that while Mr. Lee was performing his iconoclastic task he did not do it in better shape.

THEODORE CLARKE SMITH.

Reminiscences of the Civil War. By GENERAL JOHN B. GORDON. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1903. Pp. xiii, 474.)

GENERAL GORDON began his military experience as a captain in the first days of the Civil War. Before that he had known nothing of the life of a soldier. He had begun his career as a lawyer, and this vocation had been abandoned for the management of large mining properties in Georgia and Alabama. But he possessed the military genius, and when Lee surrendered Gordon was a lieutenant-general, and this at the age of thirty-three. He was one of the ablest lieutenants of the Confederate commander in the last days of the war. For the early part of the great struggle his *Reminiscences* are not so valuable as for the latter part, and for the simple reason that he was not, during the former, in a position to know much about the inner history of campaigns. In neither part does he endeavor to present a critical account of military movements. He is content, in general, to tell a simple narrative of his personal experiences. This is done in a manner at once charming and instructive. It will appeal to the general reader, just as General Gordon's lectures on the war appealed to many people in all parts of the Union. In this sense the book is one of the most notable of recent publications on the war. The mass of intelligent readers, and they are the people for whom books are chiefly written, will find it one of the best obtainable pictures of life in the Confederate army. It is probable that even the specialist will find it attractive for its human interest and for the color it affords to the general narrative of the Southern side of the war.

Yet General Gordon's book is not devoid of original material. His chapters which treat of the battle of Cedar Creek contain what the author himself tells us is entirely new material. This was the battle in which Early's troops fell on the camp of the Northern army at dawn on October 19, 1864. The Confederates brilliantly turned and surprised Sheridan's left and swept down his lines while the remainder of their army threw themselves against his front. All of the Federal forces except the Sixth Corps were thrown into confusion, and Sheridan, riding back to the sound of the heavy guns, had much ado to rally his broken ranks around